

---

**From:** Deborah Ramey-Kaible <lared1@optonline.net>  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 26, 2013 1:43 PM  
**To:** dmaxime@comcast.net  
**Cc:** Debbie Ramey Home; Mom home  
**Subject:** REPORT WE RECEIVED FOR 24 MICHIGAN

**Categories:** Red Category

REPORT WE RECEIVED FOR 24 MICHIGAN  
-VERY DIFFERENT THAN THE ORIGINAL WHICH LEADS US TO  
BELIEVE THAT THIS REPORT WAS FALSIFIED, AND WE WILL  
CONTINUE TO PURSUE THIS WITH THE INSURANCE COMPANY,  
US FORENSIC. AND OTHERS. SOMEONE NEEDS TO BE HELD  
ACCOUNTABLE FOR THIS. WE ARE VICTIMS OF A HURRICANE,  
DISPLACED FROM OUR HOME AND HAVING TO DEAL WITH  
THIS IN ADDITION.



## USF Report No. 12.2

### Results and Conclusions


Based upon the information obtained and con  
following opinions:

- 1) The physical evidence observed at the pr  
building was not structurally damaged by h  
forces, scour or erosion of the supporting  
floodwaters associated with the subject flo
- 2) The physical evidence observed at the su  
uneven roof slopes, leaning exterior walls  
within the interior of the building, were th  
movement of the building and foundation  
differential movement of the supporting  
deflection of the building framing.

---


**From:** Deborah Ramey-Kaible <lared1@optonline.net>  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 26, 2013 1:44 PM  
**To:** DMaxime@comcast.net  
**Cc:** Debbie Ramey Home; Mom home  
**Subject:** COVER LETTER SUBMITTED BY THE ENGINEER

COVER LETTER SUBMITTED BY THE ENGINEER



**From:** Deborah Ramey-Kaible <lared1@optonline.net>  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 26, 2013 1:46 PM  
**To:** Dmaxime@comcast.net  
**Cc:** Debbie Ramey Home; Mom home  
**Subject:** COVER LETTER WE RECEIVED

## COVER LETTER WE RECEIVED



---

**From:** Deborah Ramey-Kaible <lared1@optonline.net>  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 26, 2013 1:39 PM  
**To:** DMAxime@comcast.net  
**Cc:** Debbie Ramey school; Mom home  
**Subject:** ORIGINAL SUBMITTED BY ENGINEER FOR 24 MICHIGAN

**Categories:** Red Category

THIS WAS THE ORIGINAL SUBMITTED BY ENGINEER

### Results and Conclusions

Based upon the information obtained and the following opinions:

- 1) The physical evidence observed at the building was structural damaged by hydrostatic pressure during the flood event of October 29, 2012. The flood event have caused the foundation walls around the building to collapse.
- 2) The extent of the overall damages of the building and the cost of repair combined with the age of the building leads us to conclude that a repair of the building is not economically feasible.